1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION CONTAINS TO THE FEDERAL ELECTION CONTAINS TO THE PROPERTY OF THE P		
2		SECRE IARIAI	
4	4	2006 AUG 23 A 10: 29	
5	•	CLOSURE UNDER THE	
6 7		RCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM	
8	•	SENSITIVE	
9	•		
10	10 GENERAL COUNSEL'S RE	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT	
11	The Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 57	The Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 5708 as a low-rated matter. Under	
12	12 the Enforcement Priority System, matters that are low-rate	the Enforcement Priority System, matters that are low-rated	
13	13		
14	14	The Commission has determined	
15	that pursuing low-rated matters compared to other higher r	that pursuing low-rated matters compared to other higher rated matters on the Enforcement	
16	docket warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss these cases.		
17	The facts giving rise to this complaint involve respondent's, Jack Abramoff's,		
18	18 contributions to political committees during 2002. Specific	contributions to political committees during 2002. Specifically, the complainant claims that	
19	the respondent exceeded the aggregate \$25,000 contribution	the respondent exceeded the aggregate \$25,000 contribution limitation by \$9,750. The	
20	respondent denied the allegations and supplied two \$5,000 canceled checks (total of		
21	\$10,000), that were written to two different political comm	\$10,000), that were written to two different political committees and apparently signed by the	
22	respondent's wife, Pamela Abramoff. The respondent points out that both his and his wife's		
23	23 names are listed on the checks and that the two committee	names are listed on the checks and that the two committees would appear to have mistakenly	
24	attributed the contributions to Jack Abramoff, whose name was listed first at the top of the		
25	25 checks. The reports filed by the two committees confirm	checks. The reports filed by the two committees confirm that the checks were attributed to	
26	Mr. Abramoff, and not his wife.		
27	27 In light of the amount of the alleged activity and th	In light of the amount of the alleged activity and the evidence submitted by the	
28	respondent, and after a review of the merits of MUR 5708	in furtherance of the	
		•	

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

25

26 27

30

4

Case Closure Under EPS – MUR 5708 General Counsel's Report Page 2 of 2

- 1 Commission's priorities and resources relative to other matters pending on the Enforcement
- 2 docket, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should exercise its
- 3 prosecutorial discretion and dismiss the matter. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- 5 The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss
- 6 MUR 5708, close the file effective two weeks from the date of the Commission vote, and
- 7 approve the appropriate letters. Closing the case as of this date will allow CELA and
- 8 General Law and Advice the necessary time to prepare the closing letters and the case file for
- 9 the public record.

James A. Kahl
Deputy General Counsel
Deputy General Counsel

BY:

Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel

Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration

Jeff S. Jordan

Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration

28 29

Attachment:

31 Narrative in MUR 5708

1 2 3 4 **MUR 5708** 5 6 Edward Wigglesworth, Analyst for Complainant: Rest of US.org 7 8 9 **Respondents:** Jack A. Abramoff 10 Allegations: Complainant alleges that respondent, Jack Abramoff, violated the aggregate 11 \$25,000 contribution limitation in 2002. The complainant lists contributions attributed to 12 the respondent totaling \$34,750, which exceeded the annual limit by \$9,750. 13 14 15 Responses: Respondent replied by denying he exceeded the annual limit. Specifically, the respondent submitted copies of two canceled checks, which showed that his wife, 16 17 Pamela Abramoff, in fact made the two contributions at issue, which apparently exceeded the annual limit. Since both Jack Abramoff and Pamela Abramoff are listed on the 18 checks, but Jack's name is listed first the respondent speculates that the two committees 19 mistakenly attributed the contributions as coming from Jack Abramoff, as opposed to 20 Pamela Abramoff. 21 22 23 General Counsel's Note: It appears by a physical examination of the checks at issue that Pamela Abramoff signed the checks. At this point neither committee has filed amended 24 reports with the Commission correcting the alleged error in reporting. 25 26 27 Date complaint filed: February 22, 2006 28 29 Response filed: April 17, 2006